Ham-Policy Digest   Fri, 8 Jul 94   Volume 94 : Issue 300

Today's Topics:
                              (none)
                         CW ... My view.
                   Emergency TX on police freq.
             Existing regulations limit our advancem

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 94 23:12:06 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: (none)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<arrl@BIX.COM> writes:

>Seems that lots of folks feel that THEY are the control operator whenever
>they bring up the patch. What they fail to realize is that there are
>control operators and THEN there are control operators. As you and

Last time I heard, you aren't the control operator of the repeater unless (1)
the repeater licensee says you are and (2) you are, at the time, able to take
the transmitter down by some means that doesn't use the repeater's input for
control. Therefore, even if you ARE one of the control ops on your "home"
machine, if it has (for example) its control link on 1.25m you can't operate
as a control op if all you have with you is a 2m rig. (I wonder if it would be
legal to do control op duty on a machine with dial-up control by using

autopatch on a DIFFERENT repeater to call in if needed?)

This would seem to make the user-is-control-operator situation rather rare.

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 1994 16:47:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!usenet.elf.com!rpi!
psinntp!arrl.org!zlau@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ... My view.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Shawn O'Donnell (sro@media.mit.edu) wrote:
: >> In the realm of transmitters, FM transmitters are about as simple
: >> as CW transmitters, and much cheaper to operate since no manhours
: >> are wasted programming wetware modems. FM receivers are simpler than
: >> most competent CW receivers too, today a single chip in many cases.

: > An example of a competent CW transceiver is the QRP Three bander,
: > page 30-19 of the 1994 ARRL Handbook.

: I think that by "competent receiver" Gary is including that part of
: the CW receiver that encodes/decodes the signal for transmission in
: the channel. That means he's including at least a couple of parts of
: the brain of the operator, which--in some cases--may be considered to
: be more complex than one of those FM receiver ICs.

It has been my experience it takes many hours for most people to
learn how to competently design FM radio equipment--maybe even
longer than it takes to learn morse code! In fact, if you interview
enough University EE graduates, I'm sure you can find a few who
can't really qualify as skilled design engineers. I've yet
to get an email or see a post on where to get detailed construction
information for building simple voice transceivers that do as well
as the CW transceivers.
--
Zack Lau KH6CP/1   2 way QRP WAS
                            8 States on 10 GHz
Internet: zlau@arrl.org   10 grids on 2304 MHz

Date: Fri, 8 Jul 1994 06:08:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
feher@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A question to all:
     Suppose a ham radio operator is in a
life-threatening emergency with a modified radio
in his hand. Should he attempt to call/break in
on a public safety (ie police) dispatch freq.

Would this be legal in case of a true e,mergency?
Would it work or are such main dispatch frequencies
"protected" by some squelch system?

In article 79b4@dreamland.com, Jon Anhold N8USK <jga@dreamland.com> () writes:
>kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) writes:
>
>>Granted, I was assuming a totally open reverse patch. The system you
>>describe would only allow exchange of signalling messages. However,
>>if that were to happen, in the guise of the FCC's rules, that is still
>>exchange of information. Sort of akin to calling someone from a hotel
>>room, and hanging up after one ring so the person can call you back for
>>a lot less money. Sure, the message in the ham radio example would
>>carry no value, but it is still the exchange of two messages, whatever
>>the meaning may be. That could still be done with the system you
>>describe (2 of them). I know this is stretching the limits of
>>reason, but the fact that it can be done sort of demonstrates the
>>problem with allowing a non-ham to control the emissions of a repeater,
>>even though it is an "indication on the output that there is a call waiting."
>
>Ok, well, I left something out, or didn't make it totally clear. It also
>takes a DTMF code on the phone side to get the controller to signal a
>waiting call on the phone. Just because the phone rings and the controller
>answers doesn't mean the controller signals anything. You still need to
>enter a DTMF code to tell the controller that this is in fact a reverse
>patch call. Therefore, only people whom the control-operators give the
>code to may use the patch, licensed or otherwise.

You have to enter a DTMF tone (or sequence) to make the repeater
start transmitting a signal to indicate a phone call is being made?
Sounds like remote control to me. If so, the person doing the
remote controlling must be an adequately licensed amateur, no?

```
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j  | Views expressed here are
     *
 * (310) 348-6043         | mine and do not necessarily    *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com  | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *
```

Date: 7 Jul 1994 19:20:36 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!kennish@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2v1in0$c6a@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <2v1pgt$3kt@news.iastate.edu>,
<2vh9et$mdb@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <2vh9et$mdb@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>,

(Observations on repeaters deleted.)

>Personally, I don't think it is legal for a non-ham to initiate a
>reverse patch call, unless it's an emergency.
>

Exactly. In fact, I'm willing to say that reverse-patches are illegal
period. Why? When used in reverse mode, you are not using the
repeater as a repeater (i.e. not taking an RF signal on input and
retransmitting it), nor can you say that it is an ancillary function,
since it is not accessed via the input frequency of the repeater.
So, the automatic control exemptions do not apply.

Thus, where is the control operator? Clearly a non-ham can't be a control
op. If the person on the phone is a ham, where is the control point?
Can the person on the phone turn the transmitter on and off?
Maybe, maybe not. If not, then the person on the phone isn't
at the control point.

By using the repeater station in a non-repeater fashion (i.e. not
retransmissing an signal on input or performing a function
directly connected with that function, say a clean-up ID),
the "repeater" just becomes another amateur station, and
is subject to the control op/point requirements.

Granted, this is all a very gray area, but if one reads the
rules carefully, I would side with the opinion that reverse
patches are illegal.

Now that the net-lawyers are awake, how about repeaters that
automagically transmit the time out of the blue? How about
the fact that 99% of all cross-band repeat operations are illegal?

                        -Ken

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 1994 16:28:52
From: pa.dec.com!ntguru.zso.dec.com!mcleman@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun30.162157.1@woods.uml.edu>, <2v140a$otr@news.iastate.edu>,
<2v1igb$5aa@dns1.NMSU.Edu>
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

Actually, the first time I got an Iambic, I hooked it for left handed and
worked right handed. (THis is because all the folks I knew were still using
bugs, and couldn't tell me how to hook it up). Then one day my friend cam over
and said, " I didn't know you were left handed". I said I wasn't, then he
informed me that is was hooked up wrong. I had to re-learn it, but it only
took two days. :-).

Oh Well.

Jeff -- KD1IT /7

Date: 7 Jul 1994 09:11:09 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!trib.apple.com!amd!netcomsv!dodge!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2v13le$otd@news.iastate.edu>, <2v1in0$c6a@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
<2v1pgt$3kt@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

>My comment was only that any rules that allow this type of transmission
>would also allow a transmission announcing that a non-ham wants a ham to
>establish an autopatch. Some argued this point, but others said on a
>repeater you don't do this, so it doesn't compare. Well, if some
>repeaters do automatic transmissions (acting like beacons, as you say)
>then I see nothing allowing this and preventing the above type of
>"reverse autopatch" automatic transmission.

An observation of a couple of repeaters I use:

- reverse patch is available but not generally used,

  - no restrictions imposed on license hams using the reverse patch,
    (but since they are hams, they usually just use the radio, hence
    reflects the little use the reverse patch gets),

  - reverse patch is available for non-ham family members for emergency
    use only.

Personally, I don't think it is legal for a non-ham to initiate a
reverse patch call, unless it's an emergency.

73,
km6wt

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 94 22:56:40 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vc90r$kr8@agate.berkeley.edu>, <070694025041Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<070694172952Rnf0.79b4@dreamland.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Jon Anhold N8USK <jga@dreamland.com> writes:

>Correction: The amateur on the input is NOT NECESSARLY (sp?) a control
>operator of the repeater station. There is a difference.

More accurately, the amateur on the input is not ACTING AS a control operator.
Whether he is designated as such by the repeater's licensee is irrelevant in
that regard. If he's acting as a control operator, he is exercising control
either at the transmitter or through a control channel other than the input
frequency (assuming the repeater is set up in a legal manner).

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Thu, 07 Jul 1994 08:10:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!dreamland!
jga@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vc90r$kr8@agate.berkeley.edu>, <070694172133Rnf0.79b4@dreamland.com>,

<2vfbab$omv@agate.berkeley.edu>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) writes:

>Granted, I was assuming a totally open reverse patch. The system you
>describe would only allow exchange of signalling messages. However,
>if that were to happen, in the guise of the FCC's rules, that is still
>exchange of information. Sort of akin to calling someone from a hotel
>room, and hanging up after one ring so the person can call you back for
>a lot less money. Sure, the message in the ham radio example would
>carry no value, but it is still the exchange of two messages, whatever
>the meaning may be. That could still be done with the system you
>describe (2 of them). I know this is stretching the limits of
>reason, but the fact that it can be done sort of demonstrates the
>problem with allowing a non-ham to control the emissions of a repeater,
>even though it is an "indication on the output that there is a call waiting."

Ok, well, I left something out, or didn't make it totally clear. It also
takes a DTMF code on the phone side to get the controller to signal a
waiting call on the phone. Just because the phone rings and the controller
answers doesn't mean the controller signals anything. You still need to
enter a DTMF code to tell the controller that this is in fact a reverse
patch call. Therefore, only people whom the control-operators give the
code to may use the patch, licensed or otherwise.

-j

--
Jon Anhold - (jga@dreamland.com) - PGP 2.6 key available upon request
  System Administrator - Dreamland Network Systems - Cleveland Ohio
        Amateur Callsign - N8USK - N8USK@KB8GVQ.#NEOH.OH.US.NA

Date: Thu, 7 Jul 94 23:02:11 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vc90r$kr8@agate.berkeley.edu>, <070694172133Rnf0.79b4@dreamland.com>,
<2vfbab$omv@agate.berkeley.edu>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Ken A. Nishimura <kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU> writes:

>problem with allowing a non-ham to control the emissions of a repeater,

But the non-ham caller is NOT controlling the emissions of the repeater! The
repeater is transmitting a message that has been set up in advance by the
repeater's licensee, NOT a message composed by a non-ham for delivery over
amateur radio. The transmitter is active because the repeater controller
keyed it -- NOT because a non-ham keyed it.

Date: Fri, 08 Jul 1994 02:43:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!eff!neoucom.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2vclatqke1@rosebud.ncd.com>, <070694025829Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<2vf1k8$bkt@ccnet.ccnet.com>co
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
>
>: Part 97 has to be taken as a whole, no arguement. The INTENT of the
>: section would have to be exaimened before I could make a comment as
>: to the reason the FCC enacted it.
>
>: Dan
>
>Most of us who like to interpret part 97 will read the NPRM or notice of
>proposed rule making. One can get a feel of the intent of the new or
>proposed changes to a rule. In the R&O or report and order that follows,
>the comments and intent are usually stated. A careful reading of the
>footnotes will reveal a wealth of information with which to draw your own
>conclusions.

Unfortunatly I do not, right here, have access to them at this writting.

>You may wish to read the recent report and order reguarding third party
>use of a station in automatic control. You may recall this recent change
>allowed digital or packet stations to operate under automatic control
>while passing third party traffic. I find no changes to the third party
>operations of auxiliary, beacon or repeater stations in automatic control.

As I said, I would need to examine the above before I could comment
directly on the issue.

>Originally all repeater stations had to have a control station at a
>control point at all times the repeater station was in operation. This

>has been relaxed with the introduction of the concept of automatic control.

True.

>Show me a rule that allows a third party to control the emissions or
>operate an amateur transmitter with out the presence of a control
>operator.

No, your question is stated incorrectly. It should be stated '...with out
the presence of TWO control operators.' However, since a person on the
phone line of the patch (forward or reverse) has no control over ANY
amateur transmitter, the question does not obtain. If it DID, then I would
say that a non-amateur can NOT operate a ARS transmitter without a control
op present at the control point.

Gary has argued, and I BELIEVE you agreed, that there is no such thing as
an Automatic Control Operator. But, that a station is under Automatic
Control. That is, being operated WITHOUT a control operator being present
directly at the control point (i.e. running automatically), such as a
repeater during a 'user' patch, this arguably is NOT transmitting 'third
party traffic' as defined by Part 97. Thus 97.109 (e) does not apply, as
no 'third party traffic' is involved in the 'patch'.

Dan
--
"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!"   -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

----

Date: Fri, 08 Jul 1994 05:54:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
neoucom.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!dreamland!
jga@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070694172133Rnf0.79b4@dreamland.com>, <2vfbab$omv@agate.berkeley.edu>,
<Ri0TZ7r.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>But the non-ham caller is NOT controlling the emissions of the repeater! The
>repeater is transmitting a message that has been set up in advance by the
>repeater's licensee, NOT a message composed by a non-ham for delivery over

>amateur radio. The transmitter is active because the repeater controller
>keyed it -- NOT because a non-ham keyed it.

Yay!! Somebody else understands it!

-j

--
Jon Anhold - (jga@dreamland.com) - PGP 2.6 key available upon request
   System Administrator - Dreamland Network Systems - Cleveland Ohio
         Amateur Callsign - N8USK - N8USK@KB8GVQ.#NEOH.OH.US.NA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #300
****